

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 29, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 29, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraphs [0003], [0014], [0054], [0055], and [0058] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1 - 13 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 7 - 13 stand withdrawn by the Examiner and have been cancelled by Applicant. Claims 1 - 6 are rejected. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1-6 are amended to correct matters of form. Claims 1-4 are amended to clarify the invention.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2-4 have been amended.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being patentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,170,492 (*Ueda, et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,635,117 (*Kinnard, et al.*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. *Ueda* teaches removing a tungsten deposit. *Kinnard* teaches deposition apparatus, but does not suggest using the apparatus for cleaning. Therefore, *Ueda* and *Kinnard*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest activating a cleaning gas including a compound containing fluorine atoms by exposure to microwaves, introducing the cleaning gas into a chamber, raising a temperature of a shower head to a temperature greater than that used when forming a film on a substrate and removing a deposit comprising tungsten and silicon, as recited in claim 1, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of dependent claims 2-6 on grounds that they are dependent on allowable subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)